

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application.

Claims 1-20 have been rejected.

No Claims have been amended.

Reconsideration and full allowance of Claims 1-20 are respectfully requested.

I. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action rejects Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,451,884 to Sauerland ("*Sauerland*"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A prior art reference anticipates the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102 only if every element of a claimed invention is identically shown in that single reference, arranged as they are in the claims. MPEP § 2131; *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 832, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566, 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Anticipation is only shown where each and every limitation of the claimed invention is found in a single prior art reference. MPEP § 2131; *In re Donohue*, 766 F.2d 531, 534, 226 U.S.P.Q. 619, 621 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Sauerland recites a system for testing electronic components. (*Col. 1, Lines 7-8*). The electronic components (element 10) are placed in a temperature chamber (element 18), and cool air is released by a valve (element 22) and blown through a central inlet bore (element 24) of the temperature chamber to cool the components. (*Col. 6, Lines 5-17*). Once cooled, the components are tested. (*Col. 6, Lines 18-26*). After that test, a heating coil (element 34) within the chamber heats the air in the chamber to a higher temperature, and the test is repeated. (*Col. 6, Lines 27-*

33).

As previously argued in Applicant's response filed on December 16, 2003, *Sauerland* lacks any mention of an "air machine" that is operable to "controllably provide a thermally-varying air flow" as recited in Claims 1, 7, and 13. The Office Action responds by stating that "a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art." (*See, Office Action, Page 2*).

The Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner's attention to Claims 1, 7 and 13, where such a structural difference can be found in the recitation of "wherein said air machine is associable with said housing to form an at least substantially air-tight chamber ensconcing the received device under test." *Sauerland* simply recites that cool air is provided to a test chamber, and the air is later warmed by a heating coil within the chamber itself to provide a thermally-varying air flow. *Sauerland* lacks any mention or suggestion that the "heating coil" is associable with the chamber to form a substantially air-tight chamber. As a result, the Office Action fails to show that *Sauerland* anticipates Claims 1, 7, and 13 (and their dependent claims). Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the § 102 rejection and full allowance of Claims 1-20.

II. CONCLUSION

The Applicant respectfully asserts that the remaining claims in the application are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests an early allowance of such claims.

SUMMARY

If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting prosecution of this application, the Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below or at *wmunck@davismunck.com*.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees connected with this communication or credit any overpayment to Davis Munck Deposit Account No. 50-0208.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVIS MUNCK, P.C.

Date: May 28, 2009



William A. Munck
Registration No. 39,308

Docket Clerk
P.O. Drawer 800889
Dallas, Texas 75380
Tel: (972) 628-3600
Fax: (972) 628-3616
E-mail: *wmunck@davismunck.com*